THE REMONSTRANCE.

BOSTON, APRIL, 1910—SUPPLEMENT

HISSING THE PRESIDENT.

No more extraordinary incident has marked the history of the suffragist — or suffragette — movement in the United States than the hissing of President Taft on the evening of April 14, at the opening of the convention of the National Woman Suffrage Association at Washington.

When the President, several weeks before, was importuned to make an address of welcome to the convention, he consented on the condition that his doing so should not be interpreted as a committal on his part to the suffrage cause. It was with this condition perfectly understood that the convention assembled. Yet when the President, with his customary genial candor, essayed to make his real position known, and referred to the change which had come over his opinions since his boyhood, — at which period of his life he was, as he expressed it, "orthodox" on the suffrage question, — he was interrupted by an outburst of hisses from all over the hall which compelled him to wait until the disturbance subsided before he went on. When he resumed speaking, it was to administer a gentle and well-merited rebuke for the rudeness to which he had been subjected.

No subsequent explanations or apologies can make this incident less significant than it is. The average American does not regard kindly the interruption of public speakers even during heated political campaigns. This is because he believes in and practises freedom of speech. But this was no case of that kind of interruption. Neither was it parallel with the hissing of opposing speakers at legislative hearings, when some allowance may be made for the excitement of the moment. But here is the President of the United States, at the very moment when he is performing an act of courtesy, at the urgent solicitation of the suffrage leaders, hissed and hooted because he is unable to endorse woman suffrage.

It would be possible to fill many pages with press comments upon this extraordinary incident, showing the impression it has produced upon public opinion, but THE REMONSTRANCE has space for only a few. These, however, are fairly representative of the general view.

(From the Boston Herald, April 15, 1910.)

TAFT IS HISSED BY SUFFRAGISTS FOR OPPOSITION

President's Frankness in Welcoming Women Delegates to Washington Wins Him Angry Expression of Hostility.

HERALD BUREAU }
WASHINGTON, April 14 }

PRESIDENT TAFT was hissed tonight at the convention of the National American Woman Suffrage Association. Because he did not declare himself unreservedly in favor of giving the ballot to women, even his high office did not save him from a volley of hisses and even a hooting which arose from parts of the assembly room at the Arlington in such volume as to leave no doubt of the intention of his listeners to be rude.

A few minutes prior to the incident delegates to the convention had cheered the President when he entered the hall as their guest. He was about half through his speech when the ugly demonstration was made against him. The women were angry clear through, and showed their venom.

First, the President told of his early sympathy with the suffragist cause, when as a boy he had defended it in a high school oration. Then he explained that through his political experience he had somewhat modified his views.

He added that if any class did not care enough about the right to take part in government as a whole, then the danger would be that if the power should be conferred it would be exercised by the least desirable and neglected by many who would be most desirable as members of the electorate.

Taft Keeps Calm.

An outburst of hisses from all over the hall greeted this expression of the President's opinion. His words were taken as a direct reflection upon the women who were advocating suffrage for their sex.

President Taft's color heightened at the insult, but he did not lose his poise or betray any emotion when, after judicial deliberation, he resumed his speech at the close of the demonstration. In a quiet way he administered a stinging rebuke. There was no tremor in his voice, only a flash of the eye, as he said:

"Now, my dear ladies, you must show yourselves equal to self-government by exercising, in listening to opposing arguments, that degree of restraint without which successful self-government is impossible."

After stating that his father was in favor of woman's suffrage, the President said:

"At that time when I was in school at the age of 16, I was orthodox. But in the active experience I had — or I have had — I have modified my views somewhat.

"We approve and support a popular representative government, because on the whole every intelligent class which really is intelligent, knows its own interests and is better qualified to determine how those interests shall be cared for and preserved than any other class, no matter how altruistic.

Qualifications Needed.

"But I wish to call your attention to two qualifications in that statement. One is that the class should be intelligent enough to know its own interests. The theory that a Hottentot or any other unintelligent class is fitted for self-government at once, or to take part in government, I wholly dissent from. But that is not applicable to this situation.

"The other qualification is that the class should care enough for its own interests to take part in the exercise of political power if conferred upon it. If it did not, then it seems to me that the danger is in the power it confers; that it may be exercised by that sort of a class least desirable."

It was here that the hissing of the President occurred. It died out rather abruptly, and a hush of em-

barrassment followed. Whereupon the President continued:

"If I could be assured that the intelligent women as a class in a common political entity would exercise the franchise I would be in favor of it. At present there is considerable doubt if they would do so. In certain states where it has been tried it has not proved a failure. It has not made any distinct difference. I think it is possible to say that it has shown an improvement, but it has been in states where the population is sparse.

"I think the test for you is not in convincing the men, but convincing your own class. Now that is my contention."

Officers of the association were deeply chagrined over the reception given the President. There were different versions about the responsibility for the hissing. Some claimed it came solely from the rear of the hall and was by women not connected with the organization. This, however, was strenuously denied by some persons present, who say that the hissing came from practically every part of the hall.

PRESS COMMENTS

(From the Hartford Courant.)

DISCOURTESY FITLY REBUKED.

NOTHING could have been more apt than President Taft's way of meeting the discourtesy which the ill-mannered female suffragists showed to him when he had taken the trouble to attend their convention. He questioned the wisdom of female suffrage and they at once hissed him — hissed the President of the United States, who had been urged by them to do them the honor of being present at their meeting. The President did not quit the room in a huff, which he would have been justified in doing and which some quicker-tempered people would have done. He just smiled and called their attention to the fact that people who had no more self-control were manifestly unfitted for the ballot. We are utterly unable to see how the antics of the suffragists, either in this country or abroad, or the disrepute of some of their chief leaders can help their so-called "cause." The chances are that with thoughtful people the keen reminder given by the President will remain longer and count for more than all the arguments or threats of the agitators. In that way it is easy to figure out that it was well the President attended the meeting.

(From the Philadelphia Ledger.)

SUFFRAGE AND SELF-RESTRAINT.

WE need not stop to consider with what reason the assembled suffragists hissed this obvious sentiment. We need not even discuss the extreme discourtesy of hissing the President, in any circumstance, who had gone out of his way to give to the meeting his encouragement. The most important comment upon the incident he made himself when he continued:

> "Now, my dear ladies, you must show yourselves equal to self-government by exercising, in listening to opposing arguments, that degree of restraint without which successful self-government is impossible."

Intolerance of differing opinions, lack of self-restraint, incapacity for weighing argument are not exclusively feminine faults. They constitute one of the gravest dangers to self-government among men. But if the average woman is not superior to the average man in the contrary qualities, the extension of the suffrage to women will not improve the sobriety or the safety of our politics.

(From the Providence Journal.)

THE HISSING SUFFRAGISTS.

THOSE women who hissed Mr. Taft ought to feel ashamed of themselves, though it is unlikely that they will. Manifestly, they are temperamentally disqualified from expressing the more common impulses of gentlewomen and gentlemen; else they would not have hissed. Presumably the "cause" which they represent, as again represented by the association which Mr. Taft was misled into countenancing as a respectable body of his fellow-citizens, is ashamed because of the insult which was attempted in its name. Such an attempt, directed as it was at the President of the United States, may be left to carry its own penalty.

(From the Boston Post.)

IT DOESN'T HELP.

IF women who are fighting for the ballot would show a little more discretion, a little more self-control, a little more toleration for those who may honestly and courteously disagree with them, they would help their own cause materially.

The spectacle of a crowd of suffragists hissing a President of the United States because he said something that annoyed them is not calculated to impress the law-making part of humanity, or even the majority of women, with the idea that the leaders in the movement are quite prepared to take part in what Mr. Taft aptly called "the conduct of affairs."

Woman will have the ballot when, as a class, she shows that she wants it. She cannot hurry matters by exhibitions of temper.

(From the Springfield Republican.)

A DEPLORABLE LACK OF RESPECT.

THE hissing of President Taft by a portion of the audience was inexcusable; he was present by urgent invitation, and consequently he was in a real sense the honored guest of the association. Aside from that, to hiss a president of the United States, whatever he may say, is to show a deplorable lack of respect for the exalted office that he holds.

(From the New York World.)

TYROS IN POLITICS.

THE handful of women suffragists who at their meeting in Washington hissed a statement by William Howard Taft with which they did not agree are tyros in politics. If they were not they would have refrained from such an inadmissible expression of disapproval.

(From the Boston Globe.)

IN BAD TASTE AND FOOLISH.

ONE may hiss, hoot or "boo" a prime minister or a duke, or even a member of the royal family, in Great Britain, and not violate the canons of the hustings. But in the United States we have outgrown such primitive emotionalism. Even from our theatre the hiss has long been banished.

To hiss the President of the United States is not only in bad taste, but very foolish.

(From the Springfield Union.)

A LESSON TO THE SUFFRAGISTS.

THE President's mild rebuke, in which he cautioned the women to show themselves "capable of suffrage by exercising that degree of restraint which is necessary in the conduct of affairs of government by not hissing," was all the more forceful and convincing by reason of its mildness. A less tactful or coolheaded man might have created a scene injurious alike to himself and the suffragists. As it was, the President came out of it with flying colors and the offending women were chastened and subdued. The incident ought not to be without its value to the suffragists, given as many of them are to hysteria in promoting their cause.

duty of the suffrage is to be thrust upon women, it must be shown that the state will gain. The question is not one of the desire of any individual, however capable, but whether the state will gain.

That small number of women who seek this responsibility are most vague when asked how the state will gain. They say, in an indefinite way, that politics will be purified and legislation bettered. But if the conduct of the suffragettes affords any basis for judgment, will their entrance into partisan politics increase its dignity and decorum? May we expect wiser statesmanship as a result of the shrieking, scratching, biting processes that have become familiar in England? One of the results in our own suffrage states has been to develop a class of women politicians, said to be as fully alive to political tricks as the canniest ward heeler of the male sex. When Representative Shafroth of Colorado resigned his seat in Congress because he became satisfied that he had been elected by fraudulent votes, it was found that a woman had had an active share in the frauds, marking ballots and giving directions to women who were to do repeating at the polls; and one or two other women associated with her arranged to have a fight started to give a chance to throw out the watchers of the other party.

In the matter of better legislation the only tangible proposition concerns the wages of women. But in Colorado there is somewhat more than the ordinary difference in the pay of men and women teachers, for example. To propose regulating by law the wages in other than public employment, is the sheerest folly. Men have long since abandoned the thought of doing it for their own sex. If women with the ballot should try it, they would bring disaster just as it followed the attempts of men to do it centuries ago. It is an economic impossibility.

"In other matters relating to the work of women, Massachusetts already leads the world in humane legislation. The logical result of putting them on a political equality with men would be to take from them their special privileges. Do they want that? Not the great mass of them, who are very well content as they are, willing and anxious to do only their own share in the work of the world without adding that of the men.

An Adverse Report

The Committee on Constitutional Amendments voted against the amendment, 7 to 4. Last year, the vote was 8 to 3.

Defeated in the House

March 31, the report was taken up in the House, and a motion to substitute the amendment for the report was defeated by a vote, counting pairs, of 54 yeas to 155 nays. In 1909, the vote, counting pairs, was 54 yeas to 171 nays. It is a curious circumstance that the suffrage strength was exactly the same this year as last, the only difference in the record of the two years being that the number of members absent and unrecorded was greater this year than last — 31 as compared with 15.

Concurrent Action in the Senate

In the Senate, April 5 the adverse report of the Committee was accepted without debate or a division.

A FEDERATION FOR UNITED EFFORT.

THE year 1910 will be notable for the formation of a Federation of State Associations opposed to Universal Suffrage for women.

The states of Illinois, Massachusetts, New York, and Oregon, already bound by the bonds of a common purpose and a united effort, have welcomed to this Federation the newly formed and vigorous Pennsylvania Association, which has sprung into being, fully equipped with a strong Executive and a distinguished Standing Committee.

Each Association will have a representative on the Federation Committee, which will take charge of inter-state work and everywhere stretch forth the hand of encouragement and persuasion to women who are thinking of organizing to oppose the extension of the suffrage.

This Federation is the first step in the knitting together of the conservative women in every part of this broad country, to express the preponderating latent sentiment opposed to woman suffrage, hitherto largely silent, but which is being roused to assert itself by the persistent and unauthorized claims of the suffragists to the ballot.

NOTES ON SUFFRAGE AND ANTI-SUFFRAGE.

THOSE who were present at the hearing before the legislative Committee on Constitutional Amendments, in room 240 at the State House, Boston, on the evening of February 23rd, had an opportunity to observe suffragettes in the making. The hissing, derisive laughter and other demonstrations which came from the suffragist side during the hearing would have made it impossible for the remonstrants to be heard at all, had not the chairman repeatedly used his gavel to restore order. It seems a peculiar fatuity which leads women who are petitioning for a share in the government of the cities, state and nation to make such a demonstration of their own entire lack of self-control.

THE Woman's Journal of January 29th, discoursing editorially upon "Anti-Suffrage Interest Declining" cited as evidence of the decline the fact that THE REMONSTRANCE "has been appearing monthly. It has now dropped back to a quarterly." Recurring again to the subject, in its issue for February 12th, the Woman's Journal said: "As already mentioned, this small four-page sheet, the organ of the Massachusetts Association Opposed to the Further Extension of Suffrage to Women, which was published for a time as a monthly, has now dropped back to a quarterly." Now the fact is that, up to January, 1907, THE REMONSTRANCE was published only once a year. In April of that year, the first quarterly number was published, and since that date, it has appeared every three months. It never has appeared monthly, and, so far from "dropping back" has found it necessary to increase the frequency of its publication. If its career signifies anything it is not "declining" but increasing interest. The amusing thing about the error of The Woman's Journal is that the writer of both articles referred to is herself a subscriber to THE REMONSTRANCE and should

know how often the paper reaches her.

THERE are signs of returning sanity among the English suffragettes. They made few disturbances while the pollings for members of parliament were in progress. And, since the elections, their official organ has announced a decision to "use nothing but peaceful and constitutional methods, unless the Government adopt an attitude which compels the use of more drastic ones." After all, this qualifying clause leaves the way open to the resumption of the shrieking and kicking methods of "militantism" as soon as Mrs. Pankhurst and her daughter and the rest of the suffragette leaders make up their minds that their time has come. Congratulations over the return of sanity are therefore premature.

IN the Parliament which was elected in 1906, the British suffragists professed to believe that they had 420 members who were in favor of giving women the ballot. It is conceded, on all hands, that the newly-chosen House of Commons makes but a feeble showing of suffrage strength. An English suffagist organ admits that, of 211 candidates who, in one form or another, expressed views favorable to woman suffrage in their election addresses, all but 85 were defeated at the polls. Regarded as the net result of an orgy of lawlessness and violence, continued through two years more or less, this is not, from the suffragette point of view, a very encouraging exhibit.

SUFFRAGE is making no headway in the legislatures this year. In Kentucky, the House has defeated a school suffrage bill by a vote of 46 to 37. In Rhode Island, the legislature apparently has grown weary of coquetting with presidential suffrage bills. This year, the bill was adversely reported, and the report was accepted by the Senate by the overwhelming vote of 33 to 3. Only three years ago, the Rhode Island Senate actually passed a presidential suffrage bill, and it was left to the House to defeat it. In Maryland, the suffragists were encouraged by a favorable committee report upon a bill proposing to confer municipal suffrage upon the women of Baltimore, but the House of Delegates voted, 67 to 24, to indefinitely postpone the measure. Ten days later, the House adopted an adverse report upon a state-wide suffrage bill.

ASSEMBLYMAN DANA of New York City, moved by the importunities of the suffragists to an attempt to ascertain how the women of his district actually felt upon the question, caused a house-to-house canvass to be made last month. In one street, where twenty-four houses were visited, Mr. Dana's canvasser found just one woman who wanted the ballot. In another block, tenanted wholly by women who were earning their own living or were wives of men employed in manual labor, not one woman who was in favor of the suffrage was discovered. After this illuminating canvass, Mr. Dana is inclined to distrust the claims of suffragists to speak for the sex.

"EQUAL PAY for equal work" is one of the promises which the suffragists make to school teachers. THE REMONSTRANCE, in its January issue, directed attention to Miss Sumner's admission that in Colorado, the leading suffrage state, the difference between the salaries of men and women teachers, instead of being unusually small is unusually large. It is interesting now to notice that when this question came up before the New York City Board of Education, March 16, three of the four women members of the Board voted against the equal pay proposition. This is another proof that the question is not a politcal but an economic one.

TO MEN AND WOMEN WHO LOOK BEFORE THEY LEAP.

WITH these significant words the Rev. Dr. James M. Buckley dedicates his recent book on "The Wrong and Peril of Woman Suffrage," and they strike its key-note. Dr. Buckley is known as a keen controversialist, but his zeal never overrides fact and his wide acquaintance with men and women gives more than a theoretical value to his opinions. The discussion between him and the late Senator Hoar, some years ago, in The Century Magazine, was regarded on both sides as one of the ablest presentations ever made of the Woman Suffrage question, and the present volume will add to his reputation. Written in a clear, pungent style, it is both readable and concise. Anti-suffragists will find it invaluable for reference and citation, and it is already being widely circulated among them. It is published by the Fleming H. Revell Co., at 75 cents net.

WOMEN IN POLITICS.

IN Pearson's Magazine for February, Mr. Richard Barry reported certain interviews with woman suffrage leaders as to what women would do with votes if they had them. One of the most illuminating of the interviews was with Mrs. Carrie Chapman Catt. Mrs. Catt expressed the opinion that there were far more good women than there are good men, and that, if they had the vote, they would turn the scale toward the right. Mr. Barry then asked:

"If what you say is true, if women do vote, if good women take a greater interest in politics than do good men now, what will be the effect upon the great majority of American women who now live politically protected lives at home?"

"It will make them stronger, braver, better."

"But to be politically effective they will have to gain a fuller knowledge of industrial, economic and political life than they do now, and they will therefore have to leave their homes. What will become of the eighty per cent of American women who are now home-loving and home-keeping?"

Mrs. Catt paused a moment and then deliberately uttered what seemed to have been a prophecy long and soberly considered. "I believe," she said slowly, "that the time will come, and that comparatively soon, when every American woman who does not earn her own living will be considered a prostitute."

Notice to Members

Members of the Massachusetts Association Opposed to the Further Extension of Suffrage to Women will kindly inform the Secretary of any change of address. The Headquarters of the Association are at Room 615 Kensington Building, corner of Boylston and Exeter Streets, Boston.